

NOV 19 2007

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GARRISON S. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RODERICK HICKMAN; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 07-16093

D.C. No. CV-05-01340-LJO

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Lawrence J. O'Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 13, 2007^{**}

Before: McKEOWN, TALLMAN and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

This appeal from the district court's order denying appellant's motion for preliminary injunction comes to us for review under Ninth Circuit Rule 3-3. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

07-16093

We express no view on the merits of the complaint. Our sole inquiry is whether the district court abused its discretion in denying preliminary injunctive relief. *See Gregorio T. v. Wilson*, 59 F.3d 1002, 1004-05 (9th Cir. 1995). The record before us shows that the court did not rely on an erroneous legal premise or abuse its discretion in concluding that appellant had failed to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits or the threat of imminent irreparable harm and in denying preliminary injunctive relief. *See id.* The court's factual findings and application of legal standards are not clearly erroneous. *See id.* Accordingly, the court's order denying the preliminary injunction is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.